

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. No claims have been amended or canceled in this response (claims 1-11 and 19 were previously canceled). Claims 48-51 have been newly added. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections

Independent claims 12, 13, 18, 30 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Etesse et al (USDPUB 2004/0030781) (hereinafter "Etesse") in view of Angles et al (US 6385592) (hereinafter "Angles"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

As explained in the response to the previous office action mailed on 11/14/2005, the present invention relates to a technique that enables a user to access related operations for a data element in a web page, without requiring the related operations to be manually determined and coded in advance. For example, claim 38 recites:

38. A method of processing a web page comprising:
automatically classifying a data element in the web page as being of a known data type;
automatically determining a related operation that can be performed in relation to the data element, based on the data type of which the data element has been classified; and
causing the related operation to be indicated to a user when the user accesses the web page, to enable the user to invoke the related operation.
(emphasis added).

Etesse and Angles, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the above emphasized limitations in combination.

The Examiner admitted that Etesse does not disclose automatically classifying a data element in the web page as being of a known data type; automatically determining a related operation that can be performed in relation to the data element, based on the data type of which

the data element has been classified (Final Office Action mailed on 8/7/2006, page 3). The Examiner, however, alleges that Angles teaches these limitations. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that “for example, when a consumer with a demographic profile indicates an interest in farming, they would be sent customized advertisements for farm products by the advertisement provider.” The Examiner interprets the data type to be the interest, wherein interest contains the value of “farming” (*see* Final Office Action mailed on 8/7/2006, page 9). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As explained in the response to the office action mailed on 11/14/2005, Angles discloses a system for delivering customized electronic advertisements (Abstract). The customized advertisements are created based on consumer profiles stored in a registration database (Figure 4, element 68; column 14, lines 37-39). Thus, as far as what Angles discloses, a consumer’s interest, a part of a consumer’s profile,⁹ is not a data element in a web page.

Further more, Angles does not teach or suggest the combination of automatically determining a related operation that can be performed in relation to the data element, based on the data type of which the data element has been classified and causing the related operation to be indicated to a user when the user accesses the web page, to enable the user to invoke the related operation.

The Examiner does not specifically point out what disclosure in Angles he considers as teaching a related operation that can be performed in relation to the data element. The Examiner, however, alleges that Angles discloses sending advertisement based on the consumer’s demographic profile, tracking consumer responses to the advertisement and displaying future advertisement customized based on profile and usage history (*see* Final Office Action mailed on 8/7/2006, page 10). The actions of sending, tracking and displaying are at most operations

related to advertising, not to the Examiner alleged data element “farming” in his argument. Even assuming *arguendo* that these alleged operations are related to the data element “farming”, these operations are not indicated to a user when the user accesses a web page, to enable the user to invoke these operations, such as recited in claim 38.

Even though the customized advertisements are displayed to a consumer, a customized advertisement is different from an operation. An advertisement is a description of a product or service, not an operation that can be invoked by a user.

Thus, because Etesse and Angles, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every claim limitation of claim 38, claim 38 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over the cited arts.

All of the other pending independent claims include limitations similar to those discussed above and, therefore, are also not obvious based on the cited art.

Dependent Claims


In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: November 7, 2006



Jordan M. Becker
Reg. No. 39,602

Customer No. 26529
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300